

of it being acquired with their vast surplus of trade cash. It is absolutely appropriate that we maintain this friendship with Taiwan and in that friendship engage our military leadership, and I would support the amendment.

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), a distinguished member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time, and I rise in opposition to this amendment because it can potentially impact a very important part of the world for this country. It impacts not only trade, not only national security, but also cultural exchange programs.

As a Member, like my colleague the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ) that has done extensive travel to both China and to Taiwan, the issues that we are talking about here are important issues for them to resolve. It can potentially upset the One China policy that we all recognize and respect.

It is opposed by the State Department, jeopardizes our One China policy. It creates perhaps another political crisis area at a time we can least afford it.

So I rise in opposition of this amendment, and I urge its defeat.

□ 1415

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me say first that this amendment is not about friendship. We are clearly friends with the People's Republic of China and the people of Taiwan, and let there be no mistake about that. Let me also say that this amendment is not about military exchanges, because they are already authorized under the Taiwan Relations Act.

What this amendment does that is new is requires a higher level of exchanges between high-level military personnel and high-level civilian personnel, which has never, to date, been authorized by any administration.

So I think this is clearly an amendment that is interfering with a very delicate balance that exists with regard to our One China policy. It is opposed by the State Department, it is opposed by the National Security Council members, and employees who work with China. One of them said, "This is unhelpful to the national interest. It could backfire. It works against our purpose."

I urge Members to leave this matter in the hands of our President, to allow him to do this. Never have we required these higher-level visits, which to date have never been approved. I urge opposition to the amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Ryun/Bordello Taiwan Military Exchange amendment.

Military exchanges can advance our national security when they enhance the military professionalism of an ally and foster important relationships between senior military officials. I

know the value of these exchanges because I served as a civilian language instructor in Haiti where I taught French and Creole at our Navy military mission to U.S. Marines, and also taught English to Haitian military officers and enlisted personnel at the Haitian military academy. As I witnessed in Haiti, our national security is enhanced when our senior officers share their expertise with their colleagues from other nations.

The great difficulty that I have with this amendment is the faulty premise that the United States should develop a military alliance with Taiwan. In my view, the pursuit of closer military ties with Taiwan sends in inflammatory and dangerous message to China that does not promote our national security or stability in this region. The diplomatic ambiguity of the one-China policy has served our nation well. The promotion of military exchanges with Taiwan, however, will destabilize the region and could very well bring us one step closer to hostilities.

I encourage my colleagues to defeat this amendment. Our relationships with China and Taiwan are complex and nuanced, and the region is still tense after the recent Taiwan referendum. At this critical time, we should not take any action that could be interpreted as promoting Taiwan independence. I am greatly concerned, however, that the enactment of the Ryun/Bordello amendment would send a clear, but misguided, signal that will undermine peace.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Ryun amendment.

This amendment seeks to allow for educational exchanges between high level military officials from the Republic of China on Taiwan, and those in our own country. The amendment will help to improve Taiwan's self-defense capabilities, and enhance stability in the region.

The inclusion of this amendment is critical to assist the Republic of China on how best to organize and prioritize their defense needs, and how to integrate new defensive systems. The amendment also seeks how best to accelerate and facilitate existing educational exchange programs by involving more senior participants and reaching broader audiences.

For many years Taiwan has been one of our closest friends in an increasingly dangerous part of the world. Over the last several years, Taiwan has evolved into a pluralistic, free, and democratic society—despite the constant threat of military force from Communist China, and international diplomatic isolation. As members of the growing family of free nations, the people of Taiwan deserve our cooperation and support.

Mr. Chairman, the Republic of China on Taiwan is a free and democratic country, and has been a long-standing ally of the United States for the better part of a century. The passage of this amendment can only serve to enhance that alliance.

I hope that today this House will resist the efforts of the Communist government in Beijing to engineer the defeat of this important amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that in the future we can enact additional measures to improve and enhance our relationship with the government of Taiwan.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN) will be postponed.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina) having assumed the chair, Mr. UPTON, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4200) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2005, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4359, CHILD CREDIT PRESERVATION AND EXPANSION ACT OF 2004

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 644 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 644

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4359) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the child tax credit. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; (2) the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Rangel of New York or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 644 provides for 1 hour of debate in the House equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

It also provides for consideration of the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Committee on Rules report accompanying the resolution, if offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) or his designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

Finally, the resolution waives all points of order against the amendment printed in the report and provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, in 2001, Congress passed the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act, which put \$1 trillion back into the pockets of the American people and led to the strong economic recovery we are witnessing today. Without that package, the beating that our economy took as a result of September 11 would have been even more disastrous.

This relief plan expanded the child tax credit initially enacted as part of the Tax Relief Act of 1997, increasing it from \$400 to \$1,000 over 10 years. The jobs and growth package of 2003 accelerated the credit to \$1,000 in 2003 and 2004.

Today's bill, sponsored by my friend, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER), addresses the \$1,000 tax credit, which is set to snap back to \$700 in 2005 if we do not act today. In addition, the bill makes the child tax credit permanent and raises the eligibility limits on those who can claim the credit to include more middle-income parents.

Finally, the bill accelerates the refundability of the child tax credit this year to make it available to more of the Americans who need it, low-income families.

Mr. Speaker, tax relief stimulates economic growth. In 1997, unemployment was at 4.9 percent, and the Republican-led Congress passed the Balanced Budget Act. Unemployment fell to 4.5 percent in 1998, 4.2 percent in 1999, and a rock bottom 4 percent in the year 2000.

In 2001, we passed the Taxpayer Relief Act, putting nearly \$1 trillion back into the hands of American families. And given the economic history I will continue with shortly, I am convinced that we would have seen unemployment rates fall even farther. But then September 11 hit, one of the most tragic days in American history. A horrendous loss of life through a murderous act of terrorism; an act that cost our economy trillions.

Unemployment jumped to 5.8 percent in 2002 as millions of Americans lost jobs connected to tourism, services, construction, and the list goes on and on and on. But we knew what to do. We knew how to respond. We knew that simply increasing spending would not lead to long-term viability and sustained recovery. Instead, we had to find a way to put money into the hands of consumers and businesses so they could make smart economic decisions that would begin to rebuild our economy.

So we enacted tax relief. We passed the Jobs and Growth Act to spur spending by American businesses. And after unemployment hit 6 percent in 2003, we saw the positive effects of these cumulative tax cuts begin to take effect. Beginning last November, unemployment steadily began to decrease. So we passed more tax cuts to speed up the process. And you know what happened? Unemployment continued to fall, all the way to 5.6 percent.

Now, some people say that is not good enough. During the so-called tech boom, unemployment was as low as 4 percent. Well, you know what? I agree with them, we must do better. We should always strive to do better. One person unemployed is one too many. And today's bill will do exactly that. It will put \$200 billion directly into the hands of American families, families who also happen to be consumers. And every dollar they spend, whether on a package of diapers, a tank of gas, or a car payment, they will be supporting America's jobs.

At the end of the day, that is what this debate is all about, American jobs. It is all about the cumulative effect of a Republican revolution that started in 1994 and led to strong and steady growth in spite of the horrors of September 11.

Beginning 3 weeks ago, we continued our commitment to strengthening the economy by preventing job-destroying tax hikes, passing permanent extensions of the new 10 percent tax bracket, wiping out the punitive marriage penalty, and relieving many families of the burdensome and unfair Alternative Minimum Tax.

Now we have before us the Child Tax Preservation and Expansion Act of 2004. Once again, this bill will make permanent the \$1,000 child tax credit, preventing an unfair and unreasonable tax increase of \$600 on 30 million taxpayers with 49 million children. After 2010, this bill will prevent a tax hike of \$1,100 on 34 million taxpayers with 59 million children.

Finally, the bill helps our soldiers serving in combat by allowing non-taxable combat pay to be taken into account when calculating the refundable portion of the child tax credit. Currently, such pay is excluded from the calculation when calculating eligibility for the credit, thereby depriving thousands of our soldiers of a portion of the credit.

When we accelerated the child tax credit in 2003, 25 million families received checks totaling \$14 billion. That is right, \$14 billion was given back to consumers to pump into the economy. Imagine what a typical family can do with that kind of money, and \$400 is what each typical family would get, a family with one child.

This bill is an opportunity for parents to spend money on their children, whether it is for a vacation, for an education, for diapers, for groceries, for a swingset. Whatever they want, they will have the money, and they can

make the decisions. And it will also make our workforce more competitive because we will have that many more jobs.

Mr. Speaker, do we support tax relief for families, tax relief that will enable us to save for our children's education, finance a new house, pay for other activities that will continue to strengthen the economy? I do. I think the answer is a clear yes.

A "yes" vote on this rule and the underlying bill is a vote in favor of American families and a vote to spur more economic growth, so I urge a "yes" vote on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government's financial house is in disarray. In 2001, the Federal Government had historic surpluses in the trillions of dollars. In 2004, those surpluses are gone, replaced by huge deficits.

Last night, by a very small margin, the House of Representatives passed a budget with a deficit of \$367 billion. Let me repeat that: a deficit of \$367 billion. The hole we are in keeps getting deeper and deeper and deeper.

Today, we are considering a measure to make permanent child tax credits. The question is not whether hard-working parents should have tax credits for each of their children. We all agree that they should. The question is whether we are going to do it in a responsible way. Are we going to target tax relief to the middle-class families who need it most, or are we going to give yet another tax break to people who do not need it? Are we going to add to the mounting Federal debt, or are we going to do the right thing and pay for these tax breaks?

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, once again the Republicans have chosen to extend tax cuts for the wealthy without paying for them.

□ 1430

As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) pointed out earlier today, the Republican leadership is giving tax breaks to Members of Congress on the same day that they are freezing education funding for military children and freezing the most important military housing improvement program in American history. It is outrageous. The priorities are all messed up.

The Republican scheme would charge the entire \$228 billion cost to the country's maxed-out credit card to be paid for by the very children the Republicans claim they want to help. By contrast, the Democratic alternative pays for the entire cost of the child tax credits and is targeted to the people who need it most.

Mr. Speaker, more should be done to help the children and families who are struggling to get by. H.R. 4359 does not focus the help where it is needed most. The lowest-income families, earning less than \$10,750, are not helped by this bill at all. In fact, about 70 percent of the tax credits in this bill go to tax filers in the top 20 percent of income earners.

This means that a family with a parent working full time for minimum wage, and that is \$10,300 a year, would get absolutely nothing from this bill. But two-child families earning up to \$250,000 would get an extra \$20,000 in tax breaks over the next 10 years.

Advocates for children and fiscal responsibility alike have expressed their outrage that H.R. 4359 gives the majority of the benefit to wealthier families and adds \$228 billion to the national debt that children will have to pay for. The Washington Post called this bill "bad social policy, bad tax policy and bad fiscal policy."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican bill and support the Rangel substitute so working families get the help they need and so their children will not be the ones stuck with the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), my good friend from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) for yielding me this time in support of H. Res. 644, the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4359, the Child Credit Preservation and Expansion Act of 2004.

Mr. Speaker, this is a modified closed rule which provides that the minority will be able to bring an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the House floor for consideration by the full House. In this respect, H. Res. 644 is in line with the recent history and tradition of the House when debating tax legislation on the floor.

I urge the House to approve this rule in order to give the House the opportunity to consider the merits of the underlying legislation.

With this in mind, I want to commend the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) for bringing H.R. 4359 to the floor today. This bill permanently extends the full \$1,000 child tax credit that the Congress and the Bush administration were able to enact in 2001 and 2003.

Failure to get this proposal signed into law means that in 2005 an estimated 34 million families, with approximately 59 million more children, face higher taxes, as the credit is lowered to \$700, and eventually sinks to \$500 in 2011.

Moving this bill into law will make crystal clear to the American people that President Bush and the Republican Congress are committed to protecting the tax relief that we were able

to enact in 2001 and 2003. Anything less than that represents a tax hike. And clearly, based on recent economic reports, a tax hike is exactly what our economy does not need as it continues to grow.

In fact, as Treasury Secretary Snow stated this week, effective monetary and fiscal policies, "of which the President's tax cuts are a part," are enabling the economy to perform very well. This President and this Congress understood that by reducing the tax burden and improving economic incentives, we can boost economic growth and increase the flow of resources into production. That is what has occurred by following the Republican tax relief plan. By removing the heavy burden of government from the backs of small businesses and families, we are creating more economic activity which means more jobs for all Americans and ultimately more revenues to the Treasury.

We need to permanently extend this tax credit for American families, and I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in supporting this bill's passage and enactment into law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule so we may proceed to consider the underlying legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), a champion of this cause.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud co-sponsor of H.R. 4359. Last year, this House increased the child tax credit by \$400 per child. This increase from \$600 to \$1,000 per child has benefited families across the country.

Under current law, however, the child tax credit is scheduled to decrease to \$700 per child in 2005, increase to \$800 in 2009, return to \$1,000 in 2010, and fall to \$500 in 2011.

Mr. Speaker, if parents are to take advantage of this tax credit to purchase new clothes, school supplies, or a new computer for their child, or to invest in their child's future, they need to know that these tax cuts are not here today and gone tomorrow.

This legislation corrects the problem in existing law and makes the \$1,000 child tax credit permanent. When the underlying legislation we are considering today becomes law, parents will know from year to year the amount of money they have for their children.

The President's jobs and growth plan has helped to get our economy back on track. Over 500,000 jobs have been created in just the last 2 months. We must continue the tax cuts we passed last year to benefit American families and the American economy.

This bill is another step forward. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and in supporting the underlying legislation.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FERGUSON).

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, we are here today in the name of American families, to support our children and to support our children's future educational opportunities. I am not only a father, but a former teacher. This is about more than a tax credit. This is about working to expand relief to a greater number of families and to make sure those families who already benefit from the child tax credit continue to be able to do so and are not forced to face a tax increase next year.

In my home State of New Jersey, 1.4 million children benefit from the child tax credit; 1.4 million children in New Jersey benefit from the child tax credit, and over 100,000 of those children live in the congressional district I have the privilege of representing.

I want to be able to look their parents in the eye and tell them I am doing everything in my power to help them save for their children's future, their children's college fund. I want to tell them that even more children will benefit in the upcoming years. I want to be able to, in good faith, promise them that no matter what, we will help the American family in the best and worst times of the economy.

This bill will allow me and all of us to do just that. The Child Credit Preservation and Expansion Act of 2004 makes the child tax credit permanent at \$1,000 a child. If Democrats had their way, this credit would decline and then vanish in the year 2010. We will not let that happen. This bill allows a greater number of families to benefit nationwide. In addition to the 1 million families already receiving relief in New Jersey, additional families will become eligible for the credit. A greater number of joint filers and single parents will be able to use this money to save for their children's education and build for their future.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to know we put as much money as possible into the hands of American parents to be able to provide for their kids. Every dollar we allow them to save is a dollar toward a better life for their kids. A vote today to help American children is what we need to do. Vote today to make the child tax credit permanent.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the previous speaker that we do not have any problem, in fact we support and we have been a champion of the child tax credit. What we have a problem with is the fact that they do not want to pay for it. What we have a problem with is the other side of the aisle is adding \$228 billion to the debt that is being passed on to our kids.

Mr. Speaker, how does the other side go home and say I am helping children and families of our country when essentially they are just adding to the national debt? That is irresponsible. This is the most fiscally irresponsible Congress, this is the most fiscally irresponsible President in the history of our country. It is great to get up and

talk about tax relief, it is great to get up and do all of these wonderful press releases, but when it is not paid for, it is just added to the debt. That is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I wish we would have an opportunity to work together on issues that impact all of our families across the Nation. Mr. Speaker, whenever I am in my congressional district in Houston, young mothers come up to me about their needs as relates to child care.

In fact, we could estimate the number of young mothers, single parents and of course families who are in need of child care is probably growing exponentially on a continuum. Our children are in need of care.

It is unfortunate that we would extend this child tax credit and make it permanent and add \$228 billion as part of the increasing deficit, and we do

nothing to expand the actual resources that go into child care.

I am a proponent of a tax credit; but I believe it should be paid for, and it also has to be reasonable, given to those who can utilize it because they have no other resources. While we are spending \$228 billion by putting us further in debt, we are actually not creating child care facilities that can help the thousands upon thousands and millions of parents around the Nation who in fact do not have the ability to have children in their homes, but need the actual facilities which are in fact decreasing by the day because they do not have the resources.

So if my message is anything today it is that, one, child care should be bipartisan; and the tax credit should work, meaning it should be paid for. The income level should not be extended; low-income parents should be included and embraced. And then we need to answer the question when these parents come up to us in our congressional district, where can they go to take their children? Where are the child care facilities and where are the resources to support the child care facilities, and those that are both li-

censed and good and careful and caring for the children, and provide educational resources? Where are the dollars for Head Start that is a form of child care as we have seen the number of grown people who are products of Head Start? We are decreasing Head Start. Yet we go \$228 billion in debt rather than provide a tax credit that the Rangel substitute provides that answers all of our concerns.

I am disappointed this is not a bipartisan effort because I want the message from the United States Congress to be that we have concerns about child care and the needs that parents have in this particular credit.

In particular, as a woman who faced that question on a daily basis in raising her own children, and I know men have as well, it is a disappointment that we cannot be unified around this particular question. I ask my colleagues to support the Rangel substitute, I ask that we not go into debt, and I state that our number one question is to provide child care facilities, in urban and rural areas, where families can actually take advantage of them. Our job is not yet finished on that need!

### NOTICE

*Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.*

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BALLANCE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal reasons.

Ms. LOFGREN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 6:00 p.m. on account of a family commitment.

Mr. MCINTYRE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 5:00 p.m. on account of family medical reasons.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCDERMOTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KLINE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KLINE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HASTERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BACHUS, for 5 minutes, today.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 213. An act to clear title to certain real property in New Mexico associated with the Middle Rio Grande Project, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Resources.

S. 524. An act to expand the boundaries of the Fort Donelson National Battlefield to authorize the acquisition and interpretation of lands associated with the campaign that resulted in the capture of the fort in 1862, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Resources.

S. 943. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the city of Cheyenne, Wyoming, for the storage of the city's water in the Kendrick Project, Wyoming, to the Committee on Resources.

S. 960. An act to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize certain projects in

the State of Hawaii and to amend the Hawaii Water Resources Act of 2000 to modify the water resources study, to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1107. An act to enhance the Recreational Fee Demonstration Program for the National Park Service, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1576. An act to revise the boundary of Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1577. An act to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project in the State of Wyoming, to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

S. 2178. An act to make technical corrections to laws relating to certain units of the National Park System and to National Park programs, to the Committee on Resources.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 408. An act to provide for expansion of Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

H.R. 708. An act to require the conveyance of certain National Forest System lands in Mendocino National Forest, California, to provide for the use of the proceeds from such conveyance for National Forest purposes, and for other purposes.

H.R. 856. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to revise a repayment contract with the Tom Green County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1, San Angelo project, Texas, and for other purposes.